

2 transmitting visible light comprising alternating layers of high index of refraction material
3 and low index of refraction material, each of said alternating layers of high index of
4 refraction material and low index of refraction material being a separate and distinct layer
5 from adjacent layers, wherein a ratio of the total thickness of all of the layers of high index of
6 refraction material to the total thickness of all of the layers of low index of refraction
7 material, r, is greater than 0.76.

1 22. (new) An optical interference coating according to claim 21, said ratio, r, being at
2 least 0.9.

1 23. (new) An optical interference coating according to claim 21, said ratio, r, being at
2 least 0.95.

1 24. (new) An optical interference coating according to claim 21, said ratio, r, being at
2 least 1.0.

1 25. (new) An optical interference coating according to claim 21, the total number of
2 layers of high index of refraction material and low index of refraction material being greater
3 than 51.

1 26. (new) An optical interference coating according to claim 21, the total number of
2 layers of high index of refraction material and low index of refraction material being greater
3 than 55.

1 27. (new) An electric lamp comprising a light transmissive envelope containing an
2 electric light source within, wherein at least a portion of said envelope is coated with an
3 optical interference coating for reflecting infrared radiation and transmitting visible light
4 radiation, said coating comprising alternating layers of high index of refraction material and
5 low index of refraction material, each of said alternating layers of high index of refraction
material and low index of refraction material being a separate and distinct layer from adjacent
layers, wherein a ratio of the total thickness of all of the layers of high index of refraction
8 material to the total thickness of all of the layers of low index of refraction material, r, is
9 greater than 0.76.

1 28. (new) An electric lamp according to claim 27, said ratio, r, being at least 0.9.

2 29. (new) An electric lamp according to claim 27, said ratio, r, being at least 0.95.

Top Copy
3 30. (new) An electric lamp according to claim 27, said ratio, r, being at least 1.0.

4 31. (new) An electric lamp according to claim 27, the total number of layers of high
5 index of refraction material and low index of refraction material being greater than 51.

6 32. (new) An electric lamp according to claim 27, the total number of layers of high
7 index of refraction material and low index of refraction material being greater than 55.

REMARKS

Applicant's counsel thanks the Examiner for a very thorough and careful examination of the present application. This Amendment is being filed as the submission required by 37 CFR § 1.114(a) and (c). On January 21, 2003, Applicant filed an Amendment under Rule 1.116 amending claim 19 which was previously indicated as being allowed. In the Advisory action mailed January 28, 2003, the Examiner indicated that the amendment to claim 19 would be entered because it "does not change the scope of the already allowed claim" 19. See Advisory action, part 5 and continuation sheet. This Amendment therefore proceeds from the application incorporating the amended claim 19 submitted in the 116 Amendment filed January 21, 2003.

New claims 21-32 have been added to the application. No new matter has been entered. Basis for these new claims can be found in the specification and claims as filed. Presently, claims 12-16, 19 and 20 are allowed. In addition, claims 9-11 have been indicated as being allowable in the Advisory action mailed January 28, 2003. Claims 1-8, 17 and 18 stand rejected.

Claim 1 is rejected under Section 103 as being allegedly obvious over Krisl et al. (US 5,138,219). The Examiner's position is that Krisl et al. disclose an optical interference filter having 51 total layers of alternating high and low index of refraction materials, and that "*it would have been obvious* to one of ordinary skill in the art...to add one or more layers and thus having total number of layers greater than 51." See Office action, page 2, emphasis added. This rejection of claim 1 is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner has stated that it would have been obvious to add additional refractive layers to the 51 layers disclosed in Krisl et al., but has failed to provide any motivation, contained in the reference or otherwise, for doing so. In addition, this position of the Examiner ignores the fact that, prior to the invention, the addition of such additional refractive layers would have induced mechanical failure due to excessive tensile